

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

IN RE: TAASERA LICENSING LLC,
PATENT LITIGATION

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-MD-03042-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL
CASES

EXHIBIT 1 TO JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND PREHEARING STATEMENT

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
1	<p>“regularly identifiable expression” / “regular expression”</p> <p>'796 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '796 Patent: Abstract; 2:65-11:34; FIG. 1 11/6/2003 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Aho et al., “Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools,” Addison-Wesley, 1985.</p> <p>“A regular expression is a language for specifying patterns that match a sequence of characters.”</p> <p>Levine et al., “Lex & Yacc,” O'Reilly Media, Inc., 1992.</p> <p>“A regular expression is a way of describing a set of strings without having to list all the strings in your set.”</p> <p>“A single entity with various interpretations, like an elephant. To a computer scientist, it's a grammar for a little language in which some strings are legal and others aren't. To normal people, it's a pattern that you can use to find what you're looking for when it varies from case to case.”</p> <p>Wall et al., “Programming Perl,” O'Reilly & Associates, 1996.</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 6,842,796: Abstract; Fig. 1; 2:11-21; 2:22-38; 2:65-3:34 3:35-40 3:66-4:4 5:15-6:15 6:16-11:33 12:39-44 Claims 1-6, 9, 12-14, 15-17, 20, 23-25.</p> <p>File history for U.S. Patent No. 6,842,796: Non-final Office Action dated August 4, 2003, at pp. 1-6; Amendment and Response to Office Action dated November 4, 2003, at pp. 1-9; Final Office Action dated January 29, 2004, at pp. 1-7; Declaration of Prior Invention Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 dated April 29, 2004.</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
		"Fast Regular Expression Matching using FPGAs," Sidhu & Prasanna, 9 th Annual IEEE Symposium on Field-Programmable Custom Computing Machines, IEEE, 2001	
2	"if the new program is validated, permitting the new program to continue loading and to execute in connection with the computing device;" '137 Patent Claims 6, 13, 14, and 24	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '137 Patent: 3:30-62; 6:64-67; 7:39-50; 8:52-10:15; FIGS. 4A, 4B, 5, 6 01/11/2007 Response to Office Action 09/04/2007 Appeal Brief 05/09/2008 Appeal Brief 10/24/2008 Appeal Brief 04/16/2009 Appeal Brief	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 7,673,137: Abstract; 3:20-41; 4:50-65; 6:64-7:30; 8:63-9:11; 10:49-61; File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,673,137: Sept. 4, 2007 Appeal Brief at 7; Sept. 4, 2007 Appeal Brief at 12
3	"an execution module coupled to the detection module and operable for monitoring, at the operating system kernel	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '137 Patent: Abstract; 3:42-4:18; 4:40-5:11; 6:42-7:30; 8:28-9:11; 9:38-10:61; FIG. 6 01/11/2007 Response to Office Action 09/04/2007 Appeal Brief 05/09/2008 Appeal Brief	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 7,673,137: FIG. 1; FIG. 6; FIG. 7; Abstract, 3:20-41; 3:37-39; 3:54-62; 4:11-14; 4:60-62; 4:66-5:11; 6:64-7:30; 8:31-32; 8:38-39; 8:63-9:8 9:9-11; 9:38-41; 9:63-66; 10:3-7; 10:12-15; 10:25-48; 10:49-61; File History, Sep. 4, 2007 Appeal Brief at 7, 12.

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	<p>of the computing device, the program in response to the trigger intercepted by the detection module”</p> <p>’137 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p>10/24/2008 Appeal Brief</p> <p>04/16/2009 Appeal Brief</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached).</p>	<p>U.S. Prov. Pat, App. No. 60/345/432 at 6:32-7:22; 12:18-28; FIG. 1</p>
4	<p>“network administration traffic”</p> <p>’356 Patent Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, and 18</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> ’356 Patent: Abstract; 3:11-45; 5:42-64; 8:21-37; FIGS. 2, 7</p> <p>01/08/2007 Response to Office Action</p> <p>08/14/2007 Appeal Brief</p> <p>02/08/11 Request for Rehearing of Patent Board Decision</p> <p>05/02/11 Request for Continued Examination</p> <p>09/01/11 Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</p> <p>09/06/2011 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 8,127,356: Abstract, 3:11-32, 4:1-4, 5:25-6:32, 8:21-37, Figs. 2, 7</p> <p>File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,127,356: Dec. 10, 2010, Decision on Appeal at 10, Feb. 8, 2011, Request for Rehearing under Rule 41.52 at 4, Mar. 3, 2011, Decision on Request for Rehearing at 4, May 2, 2011 Amendment at 6, 17-19</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. John R. Black, Jr. (see attached).</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
		<u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached).	
5	<p>“[third/fourth] program instructions to determine if the packet is network administration traffic”</p> <p>'356 Patent Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, and 17</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'356 Patent: Abstract; 3:11-45; 5:42-6:32; 8:21-37; FIGS. 2, 7</p> <p>01/08/2007 Response to Office Action</p> <p>08/14/2007 Appeal Brief</p> <p>02/08/11 Request for Rehearing of Patent Board Decision</p> <p>05/02/11 Request for Continued Examination</p> <p>09/01/11 Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</p> <p>09/06/2011 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached).</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,127,356: Abstract, 3:11-32, 4:1-4, 5:25-6:32, 8:21-37, Figs. 2, 7</p> <p>File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,127,356: Dec. 10, 2010, Decision on Appeal at 10, Feb. 8, 2011, Request for Rehearing under Rule 41.52 at 4, Mar. 3, 2011, Decision on Request for Rehearing at 4, May 2, 2011 Amendment at 6, 17-19</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Expert Declaration of Dr. John R. Black, Jr. (see attached).</p>
6	“attestation”	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u>	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	<p>'441 Patent Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7</p> <p>'616 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p>'441 Patent: Abstract; 4:4-16; 6:1-61; 9:8-17; 11:20-38; 12:48-63; 14:39-15:4; 18:57-19:40; 19:64-22:49</p> <p>'616 Patent: 1:15-18; 2:14-50; 3:47-4:24; 5:41-58; 8:23-32; 10:51-11:15; 11:59-12:38; 19:54-65; FIGS. 1, 4</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Attestation: "Process of proving the integrity and authenticity of the attestee's software and/or hardware component to a verifier."</p> <p>https://sconedocs.github.io/glossary/</p>	<p>U.S. Patent No. 9,092,616: 1:14-18; 2:66-3:4; 3:40-46; 3:49-52; 3:55-4:5; 4:6-21; 11:8-15; 12:28-38; 15:54-63; 27:42-47; Figs. 1, 4.</p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Abstract; 1:29-59; 2:16-43; 3:12-46; 3:61-4:15; 4:17-33; 6:1-19; 6:24-32; 6:52-61; 7:2-60; 8:5-9:7; 9:47-10:67; 11:4-60; 12:22-56; 13:4-16; 13:30-46; 14:39-48; 15:28-47; 16:5-13; 16:33-48; 18:57-19:36; 19:64-20:40; 20:59-22:12; 23:3-39; Figs. 2-5.</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>"Attestation is a mechanism for software to prove its identity. The goal of attestation is to prove to a remote party that your operating system and application software are intact and trustworthy." Attestation and Trusted Computing-J Bare (2006).</p> <p>attestation (n) "The process of verifying that a computer is really the computer it claims to be, and is running the software it claims to be running." Dictionary of Computer and Internet Terms (2016)</p>
7	<p>"runtime"</p> <p>'616 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'616 Patent: 2:51-3:10; 22:15-31; 25:65-26:19</p> <p>10/01/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>04/14/14 Request for Continued Examination</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 9,092,616: Abstract; Figs. 1, 3A, 6, 7B, 19-22, 25; 1:15-18; 1:38-44; 2:51-3:10; 4:28-32; 7:8-12; 8:9-22; 10:39-50; 14:15-52; 14:53-17:64; 22:60-65; 25:27-45; 25:65-26:44; 28:6-60; 29:1-15; 29:24-37; 29:46-60; 30:21-</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
			<p>59; 31:57-59; 32:45-59; 35:55-36;3; Claims 1, 8, 14, 17, 20.</p> <p>File History of U.S. Patent. No. 9,092,616 (Taasera0001246 et seq.): Non-final Office Action dated July 18, 2013, at pp. 1-30; Response to Non-final Office Action dated October 1, 2013, at pp. 1-32; Final Office Action dated January 17, 2014, at pp. 1-37; Response to Office Action dated April 14, 2014, at pp. 1-17. See 2014-04-14 Amendment in response to rejection over Wootton. Applicant added "sending, by the endpoint trust agent on a monitored device, a dynamic context including endpoint events and actions of the monitored device and applications executing on the monitored device at runtime," Response to Office Action (April 14, 2014) at 2, arguing "However, in Wootton, there is no live correlation of application actions on a device, instead behavioral data is collected from an emulator running the application and it is heuristics based." Id. at 16.</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>"run time": The period of time during which a program is actually being executed, or the time taken for execution. It does not include the time during which the program is loaded, or is compiled or assembled." The Facts On File Dictionary of Computer Science (2001)</p>
8	"At runtime"	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'616 Patent: 2:51-3:10; 22:15-31; 25:65-26:19</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	'616 Patent Claim 1	<p>10/01/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>04/14/14 Request for Continued Examination</p>	<p>U.S. Patent No. 9,092,616: Abstract; Figs. 1, 3A, 6, 7B, 19-22, 25; 1:15-18; 1:38-44; 2:51-3:10; 4:28-32; 7:8-12; 8:9-22; 10:39-50; 14:15-52; 14:53-17:64; 22:60-65; 25:27-45; 25:65-26:44; 28:6-60; 29:1-15; 29:24-37; 29:46-60; 30:21-59; 31:57-59; 32:45-59; 35:55-36;3; Claims 1, 8, 14, 17, 20.</p> <p>File History of U.S. Patent. No. 9,092,616 (Taasera0001246 et seq.): Taasera0001374-1404; Taasera0001456-1487; Taasera0001492-1529; Taasera0001570-1586. See 2014-04-14 Amendment in response to rejection over Wootton. Applicant added "sending, by the endpoint trust agent on a monitored device, a dynamic context including endpoint events and actions of the monitored device and applications executing on the monitored device at runtime," Response to Office Action (April 14, 2014) at 2, arguing "However, in Wootton, there is no live correlation of application actions on a device, instead behavioral data is collected from an emulator running the application and it is heuristics based." Id. at 16.</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>"run time": The period of time during which a program is actually being executed, or the time taken for execution. It does not include the time during which the program is loaded, or is compiled or assembled." The Facts On File Dictionary of Computer Science (2001)</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
9	<p>“a computing platform comprising a network trust agent”</p> <p>'616 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'616 Patent: Abstract; 13:20-28; 25:36-45; 26:29-34; 32:45-55; 34:5-8; FIGS. 5, 12, 13, 21</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 9,092,616: Abstract; Figs. 12, 13, 21, and 22; 6:20-7:30; 8:9-22; 12:41-46; 14:54-15:5; 16:32-40; 18:3-11; 18:40-55; 25:9-26:44; 32:40-44; 32:45-34:13; Claims 1, 8, 14, 15, 16.</p> <p>File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,092,616 (Taasera0001246 et seq.): Taasera0001374 – 1404; Taasera0001456-1487; Taasera0001492-1529; Taasera0001570-1586.</p> <p>'616 File History, Pages 195-196, 258 (from August 27, 2013 Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority).</p> <p>'616 File History, Page 260 (from August 27, 2013 Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority).</p> <p>'616 File History, Page 263 (from August 27, 2013 Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority).</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Expert Declaration of Dr. Aviel D. Rubin (see attachment)</p>
10	<p>“receiving ... a runtime execution context indicating attributes of the application at</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'441 Patent: Abstract; 7:37-60; 18:55-20:40; FIGS. 8, 9, and 10</p> <p>06/29/2012 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Figs. 8-9, 7:37-40; 7:51-60; 8:5-20; 11:20-22 ;11:39-54; 14:45-48; 18:61-63; 19:15-17; 19:41-56; 20:57-21:9; Claim 4.</p> <p>File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Non-final Office Action dated April 27, 2012, at pp. 1-10; Response to</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	runtime, wherein the attributes comprise one or more executable file binaries of the application and loaded components of the application" '441 Patent Claims 1 and 4		Office Action dated June 29, 2012, at pp. 1-34.
11	"a security context providing security information about the application" '441 Patent Claims 1, 4, and 5	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '441 Patent: 3:12-4:16; 6:65-7:12; 7:37-47; 11:20-32; 15:5-17:14; 18:38-19:30; FIGS. 1, 8 06/29/2012 Response to Office Action	<u>Intrinsic Evidence</u> U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: claims 1, 17; 6:33-37; 6:65-7:7; 7:37-47; 2:59-61; 3:19-22; 8:11-12; 9:40-46; 11:61-64; 16:33-44; 18:60-19:1; 19:20-24; 14:45-48; 6:14-19; FIG. 1 (110, 111); FIG. 3 (305, 312); FIG. 4 (403, 410); FIG. 5 (503, 510, 514, 519, 520); FIG. 8 (810) File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Response to Office Action (June 29, 2012) at 4, 19, 22-23

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
12	<p>“an application artifact”</p> <p>’441 Patent Claim 2</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’441 Patent: Abstract; 1:52-2:11; 2:36-43; 3:12-4:16; 7:27-8:4; 9:55-10:46; 11:20-32; 11:65-12:9; 12:48-63; 14:54-62; 16:5-62; 18:27-30; 19:12-20; 19:43-22:12; FIGS. 8, 9, 10, 12</p> <p>06/29/2012 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Abstract; 1:59-63; 2:40-43; 7:27-36; 7:61-8:4; 10:25-34; 11:20-26; 11:65-12:3; 12:48-63; 14:54-62; 19:48-56; 20:26-36; FIG. 1 (107); FIG. 2 (206); FIG.3 (308, 309, 310); FIG. 4 (407); FIG. 5 (505, 507, 508, 509, 512, 513); FIG. 9 (930, 940); FIG. 12 (1210, 1220, 1230); FIG. 13 (1310, 1320)</p> <p>File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Response to Office Action (June 29, 2012) at 17-18, 23-25, 26-27, 31-32; Interview Summary (June 14, 2012); Non-Final Office Action (April 27, 2012) at 6.</p>
13	<p>“introspective security context”</p> <p>’441 Patent Claims 4 and 5</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’441 Patent: 19:20-24</p> <p>06/29/2012 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: 2:59-61; 3:19-22; 7:2-7; 9:40-46; 11:30-32; 12:64-67; 16:33-44; 18:37-44; 19:20-24</p> <p>File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: Taasera0000281-289; Taasera0000301-334.</p>
14	<p>“the application of the restriction of the user's transaction”</p> <p>’441 Patent</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’441 Patent: 19:25-19:40</p> <p>06/29/2012 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: 13:11-16; 19:25-40; Claims 9-11.</p> <p>File history for U.S. Patent No. 8,327,441: TAASERA-0000244-246.</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	Claim 11		
15	<p>“return URL”</p> <p>'419 Patent Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 19</p> <p>'634 Patent Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8</p> <p>'251 Patent Claims 1-6, and 8-10</p> <p>'453 Patent Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, and 16-18</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'419 Patent: Abstract; 6:10-8:67; FIGS. 2-5 10/08/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>'634 Patent: Abstract; 6:13-8:67; FIGS. 2-5 07/02/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>'251 Patent: Abstract; 6:23-9:18; FIGS. 2-5 07/11/2017 Response to Office Action</p> <p>'453 Patent: Abstract; 6:19-9:13; FIGS. 2-5 10/13/2016 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>URL: “An Internet address which directs a browser to a specific location where an Internet resource, such as a Web page or document, is located.</p> <p>Wiley Electrical and Electronics Engineering Dictionary, 2004</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'419 Patent: 3:53-55; 6:54-7:28; 8:37-67; Figs. 3, 7</p> <p>File History for '419 Patent (Taasera-0002887 et seq.): Appellant's Brief In Response to Office Action Under 37 C.R.F. § 1.192 at pp. 2-4, 6-7 (Taasera-0002999 – 3001; Taasera-0003003 - 3004</p>
16	<p>“evaluating[, by the computer,] the URL to determine whether encryption of</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'419 Patent: Abstract; 6:10-8:67; FIGS. 2-5 06/25/2007 Response to Office Action 10/08/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>'634 Patent: Abstract; 6:13-8:67; FIGS. 2-5 07/02/2014 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'419 Patent: Abstract; 1:6-13; 4:21-51; 6:10-31; 6:35-7:8; 8:37-67; Figs. 2, 3, 6, 7</p> <p>File History for '419 Patent (Taasera-0002887 et seq.):</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	<p>[none, part, or all of]the URL is required”</p> <p>’419 Patent Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 17</p> <p>’634 Patent Claims 1 and 4</p>		<p>Amendment and Response to Office Action dated September 12, 2006, at pp. 10-12 (Taasera-0002956 – 2958)</p> <p>Amendment After Final Rejection in Response to Office Action dated March 26, 2007, at pp. 10-12 (Taasera-0002983 – 2985)</p> <p>Appellant’s Brief In Response to Office Action Under 37 C.F.R. 1.192, at pp. 2-3, 6-7 (Taasera-0002999 – 3000; Taasera-0003003 – 3004)</p> <p>Decision on Appeal, at pp. 5-7 (Taasera-0003161 – 3163)</p>
17	<p>“determining, by the computer, whether encryption is required for none, part, or all of a return URL” /</p> <p>“determining[, by the computer,] whether encryption of a return URL of the</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’419 Patent: Abstract; 6:10-8:67; FIGS. 2-6 06/25/2007 Response to Office Action 10/08/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’634 Patent: Abstract; 6:13-8:67; FIGS. 2-5 07/02/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’251 Patent: Abstract; 6:23-9:18; FIGS. 2-5 07/11/2017 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’453 Patent: Abstract; 6:19-9:13; FIGS. 2-5 10/13/2016 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’419 Patent: Abstract; 1:6-13; 4:21-51; 6:10-31; 6:35-7:8; 8:37-67; Figs. 2, 3, 6, 7</p> <p>File History for ’419 Patent (Taasera-0002887 et seq.):</p> <p>Amendment and Response to Office Action dated September 12, 2006, at pp. 10-12 (Taasera-0002956 – 2958)</p> <p>Amendment After Final Rejection in Response to Office Action dated March 26, 2007, at pp. 10-12 (Taasera-0002983 – 2985)</p> <p>Appellant’s Brief In Response to Office Action Under 37 C.F.R. 1.192, at pp. 2-3, 6-7 (Taasera-0003161 - 3163)</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	requested resource is required" / "determining, by the computer, whether encryption of a return URL of the requested resource is required" / "determining by the computer, [whether/that] encryption of the contained URL [is/is not] required" / "determining, by the computer, that encryption of the return URL is required" /		Decision on Appeal, at pp. 5-7 (Taasera-0003161 – 3163)

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	<p>“determining, by the computer, whether encryption of the contained URL is required” / “determine that encryption of the URL is not required” / “determining by the computer, that encryption of the return URL is not required”</p> <p>'419 Patent Claims 1, 4, 13, and 19</p> <p>'634 Patent Claims 1 and 4</p>		

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	'251 Patent Claims 1-6 and 8-10 '453 Patent Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18		
18	“determining whether encryption of none, part, or all of a return URL of the requested resource that is to be returned to a location of the resource request” '419 Patent Claim 10	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '419 Patent: Abstract; 6:10-8:67; FIGS. 2-6 06/25/2007 Response to Office Action 10/08/2013 Response to Office Action <u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached).	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '419 Patent: Abstract; 1:6-13; 4:21-51; 6:10-31; 6:35-7:8; 8:37-67; Figs. 2, 3, 6, 7
19	“determining[, by the	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '419 Patent: Abstract; 6:10-8:67; FIGS. 2-6	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	<p>computer,] whether the URL of the requested resource is required”</p> <p>’419 Patent Claims 2 and 11</p> <p>’634 Patent Claim 2</p>	<p>06/25/2007 Response to Office Action</p> <p>10/08/2013 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’634 Patent: Abstract, 6:13-8:67; FIGS. 2-6</p> <p>07/02/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached).</p>	<p>’419 Patent: Abstract; 1:6-13; 4:21-51; 6:10-31; 6:35-7:8; 8:37-67; Figs. 2, 3, 6, 7</p>
20	<p>“compliance state of the endpoint”</p> <p>’038 Patent Claims 1,12, and 23</p> <p>’997 Patent Claims 1, 11, and 21</p> <p>’918 Patent Claims 1, 9, and 17</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’038 Patent: 9:28-33; 39:35-63; 58:15-36</p> <p>06/04/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’997 Patent: 9:39-44; 40:17-35; 59:40-61</p> <p>04/14/2016 Response to Office Action</p> <p>09/16/2016 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’918 Patent: 9:16-60; 39:51-40:18; 59:10-44</p> <p>08/21/2017 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No 8,955,038: 3:20-26; 8:53-60; 15:37-47; 21:31-47; 23:56-65; 25:40-43; 27:14-16; 27:35-57; 27:65-28:30; 37:39-41; 39:16-17; 49:58-50:8; 56:20-28; 56:49-62; 58:15-24.</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
21	<p>“compliance polic[y/ies]”</p> <p>’038 Patent Claims 1,12, and 23</p> <p>’997 Patent Claims 1, 11, and 21</p> <p>’918 Patent Claims 1, 9, and 17</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’038 Patent: 4:30-44; 25:40-26:19; 27:36-57; 54:49-58:14; 59:43-60:31; FIGS. 1, 7</p> <p>06/04/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’997 Patent: 4:36-50; 27:41-28:18; 51:7-11; 56:3-58:27; 59:20-60:4; FIGS. 1, 7</p> <p>04/14/2016 Response to Office Action</p> <p>09/16/2016 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’918 Patent: 27:27-28:4; 50:52-56; 55:36-16; 57:3-65; 58:57-59:10; FIGS. 1, 6, 7</p> <p>08/21/2017 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No 8,955,038: 27:14-16; 27:35-57; 28:7-30; 49:58-50:8; 56:20-28; 56:49-62</p>
22	<p>“real-time”</p> <p>“real time”</p> <p>’948 Patent Claims 1 and 2</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>’948 Patent: Abstract, 8:9-22; 9:39-48; 18:21-31; 28:16-27; 35:41-50</p> <p>11/13/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>’518 Patent: 2:56-3:2; 3:22-37; 10:44-11:8</p> <p>05/19/2014 Response to Office Action</p> <p>02/09/2015 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Real time: “Chiefly <i>Computing</i>. A. n. The actual time during which a process or event occurs, esp. one analysed by a computer, in</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: 3:34-47, 8:9-22, 9:43-48, 18:21-31, 23:4-8, 28:15-16, 35:41-50, 36:35-39, Amendment dated November 13, 2014, p.8-9, 17-19, Notice of Allowance dated December 24, 2014 p. 4-5</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>Computer Graphics Dictionary 2002 (“real time”)</p> <p>Concise Oxford English Dictionary 2011 (“real time”)</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
		<p>contrast to time subsequent to it when processing may be done, a recording replayed, etc.”</p> <p>https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/238662?redirectedFrom=realtime#eid</p> <p>Real time: “That which occurs instantaneously, or so quickly that processing, entering, adaptation, or any other response is [at] lease as fast as a triggering event or circumstance.”</p> <p>Wiley Electrical and Electronics Engineering Dictionary, 2004</p>	
23	<p>“substantially real time”/ “substantially real-time data”</p> <p>'518 Patent Claims 1, 10, and 17</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '518 Patent: 2:56-3:2; 3:22-37; 10:44-11:8 05/19/2014 Response to Office Action 02/09/2015 Response to Office Action</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Eric Cole (see attached). Real time: “Chiefly <i>Computing. A. n.</i> The actual time during which a process or event occurs, esp. one analysed by a computer, in contrast to time subsequent to it when processing may be done, a recording replayed, etc.”</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 9,071,518: 2:56-3:2; 3:22-37; 5:21-37; 6:11-14; 7:50-51; 10:44-65; 10:66-11:8; 11:55-12:2; 13:25-44; Claims 1, 10, 17</p> <p>File History of U.S. Patent No. 9,071,518 (Taasera0000401 et seq.): Taasera0000789-798</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Aviel D. Rubin (see attached). Computer Graphics Dictionary 2002 (“real time”) Concise Oxford English Dictionary 2011 (“real time”)</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
		<p>https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/238662?redirectedFrom=realtime#eid</p> <p>Real time: "That which occurs instantaneously, or so quickly that processing, entering, adaptation, or any other response is [at] lease as fast as a triggering event or circumstance."</p> <p>Wiley Electrical and Electronics Engineering Dictionary, 2004</p>	
24	<p>"which includes a network analyzer, an integrity processor, an event correlation matrix, a risk correlation matrix, and a trust supervisor"</p> <p>'948 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'948 Patent: 5:21-24; 8:9-22; 12:45-13:15; 14:22-31; 14:50-15:46; 16:29-17:7; 17:16-18:31; 18:57-19:5; 21:1-13; 22:26-23:18; 23:46-64; 24:51-67; 29:66-30:4; 30:45-49; 31:26-31; 31:47-52; 31:60-64; FIGS. 4, 6, 7A-7C, 8, 10, 19</p> <p>11/13/2014 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: 1:46-2:6; 3:8-9; 4:39-5:58, 6:20-7:30; 8:17-22; 13:13-14; 13:43-56; 14:23-30; 14:60-15:2; 15:10-19; 17:16-32; 17:46-53; 17:54-61; 18:15-21; 18:21-31; 18:48-56; 22:26-37; 23:4-8; 26:61-64; 30:5-6; 30:45-49; 31:5-11; 31:35, 34:63-35:7; 36:40-44; 37:49-54; 39:3-10; 39:25-40:12; Figs. 6, 7A-C, 8, 10.</p> <p>File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: Pages 87-88, 94 (from July 17, 2014 Non-Final Office Action), Page 199 (from August 27, 2013 Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority); see also id., Pages 61-62 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment and showing Applicant amending and withdrawing this claim from prosecution); Pages 135-136 (from April 11, 2014 Restriction Requirement); 293 (from July 27, 2012 as-filed claims of the application leading to the '948 Patent).</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
			<p>'948 File History, Pages 32-33 (from December 24, 2014 Notice of Allowance), 62-63, 69-72 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment and showing Applicant's claim amendments and arguments to gain allowance of the claim that later issued as '948 Patent claim 1). '948 Patent, Abstract.</p> <p>'948 File History, Pages 135-136 (from April 11, 2014 Restriction Requirement). <i>See also id.</i> at Pages 61-62 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment and showing Applicant amending and withdrawing this claim from prosecution).</p> <p>'948 File History, Pages 61-62 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment and showing Applicant amending and withdrawing this claim from prosecution). '948 File History, Pages 195-196, 202 (from August 27, 2013 Written Opinion of the International Searching Authority).</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> Expert Declaration of Dr. Aviel D. Rubin (see attached).</p>
25	<p>“operational integrity of the application”</p> <p>'948 Patent</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '948 Patent: Abstract; 12:55-13:15; FIGS. 1, 4, 5, 8</p> <p>11/13/2014 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: Abstract; 2:15-24; 2:67-3:5; 6:20-23; 12:56-63; 13:1-15; 14:51-65; 17:12-15; 17:46-50; 18:15-31; 32:30-35; 36:27-30; Figs. 1, 5, 8, 21</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	Claim 1		
26	<p>“an event correlation matrix”</p> <p>'948 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'948 Patent: 15:3-41; 17:17-34; 22:66-23:3; 30:45-49; 31:47-52; FIGS. 4, 6, 7C</p> <p>11/13/2014 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: Figs. 4, 6, 7; 5:17-24; 6:43-53; 12:27-37; 12:45-54; 14:23-30; 14:50-15:2; 15:10-41; 16:23-37, 16:38-44, 16:45-56; 17:16-34; 21:1-13, 22:8-36; 22:67:23:3; 23:46-63, 24:51-54; 30:45-49; 31:46-52, 31:60-63; 36:40-44; 37:49-54; 39:3-10; 39:25-30; Figs. 6, 7A-C</p> <p>'948 File History, Page 32-33 (from December 24, 2014 Notice of Allowance), 62-63, 69-72 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment and showing Applicant's claim amendments and arguments to gain allowance of the claim that later issued as '948 Patent claim 1).</p> <p>'948 File History, Pages 58-59, 62-63 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment); <i>see also</i> '948 Patent at 22:66-23:3.</p>
27	<p>“a risk correlation matrix”</p> <p>'948 Patent Claim 1</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>'948 Patent: 5:21-24; 8:9-22; 12:45-13:15; 14:22-31; 14:50-15:2; 16:29-17:7; 17:17-34; 18:57-19:5; 21:1-13; 23:46-64; 24:51-67; 31:60-64; FIGS. 4-6, 7C</p> <p>11/13/2014 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u></p> <p>U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: Figs. 4, 6, 7 5:17-24; 6:43-53; 12:27-37; 12:45-54; 14:23-30; 14:50-15:2; 15:10-41; ; 16:23-37; 16:38-44; 16:45-56; 17:16-34; 21:1-13, 22:8-36, 22:66-23:3, 23:46-63; 24:51-54; 30:45-49, 31:46-52, 31:60-63; 36:40-44; 37:49-54; 39:3-10; 39:25-30;.</p> <p>'948 File History, Pages 32-33 (from December 24, 2014 Notice of Allowance), 62-63, 69-72 (from November 13,</p>

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
			2014 Amendment and showing Applicant's claim amendments and arguments to gain allowance of the claim that later issued as '948 Patent claim 1). '948 File History, Page 57 (from November 13, 2014 Amendment); see also '948 Patent at 14:23-28.
28	“correlating, by the event and risk correlation matrix” '948 Patent Claim 1	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '948 Patent: 5:21-24; 8:9-22; 12:45-13:15; 14:22-31; 14:50-15:41; 16:29-17:7; 17:17-34; 18:57-19:5; 21:1-13; 22:66-23:3; 23:46-64; 24:51-67; 31:47-52; 31:60-64; FIGS. 4-6, 7C 11/13/2014 Response to Office Action	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: 5:17-24; 12:45-54; 14:23-30; 14:56-59; 15:10-28; 15:38-41; 16:29-37; 16:38-44; 16:45-56; 17:22-30; 24:51-54; FIGS. 4-6, 7A-C; Claim 1, Figs. 4, 6, 7
29	“the event and behavior correlation engine” '948 Patent Claim 3	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '948 Patent: 8:9-42; 15:61-67; FIG. 1 11/13/2014 Response to Office Action	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 8,990,948: Claim 3
30	“formatting the status information”/ “the ... data is	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '518 Patent: 10:23-65 05/19/2014 Response to Office Action 02/09/2015 Response to Office Action	<u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 9,071,518: 10:34-37; Tables 2-4

#	Claim Term(s), Phrase(s), or Clause(s)	Taasera's Evidence	Defendants' Evidence
	formatted" '518 Patent Claims 1, 10, and 17		
31	"initiating... at least one action" / "initiate an action" '518 Patent Claims 1, 10, and 17	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> '518 Patent: 2:5-35; 2:56-3:37; 11:55-12:2; 14:9-15; 14:37-53; 15:22-30; TABLE 1, FIG. 3 05/19/2014 Response to Office Action 02/09/2015 Response to Office Action</p>	<p><u>Intrinsic Evidence:</u> U.S. Patent No. 9,071,518: 19:13-17; Tables 1 and 2; 2:15-17;2:62-65; 2:3:29-33; 11:66–12:2.</p> <p><u>Extrinsic Evidence:</u> "Initiate: to cause or facilitate the beginning of" Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2010 Initiate - Definition and More from the Free Merriam-Webster Dictionary (archive.org)</p>